2/4/70

Dear Paul (cc Gary),

This is a thinking-out-loud letter. Nothing may come of what I will go into, but on the chance it can or might, I consult in advance.

For more than a month, new friends have been trying to recall the name of a man who is director of a new fund for investigative reporting, to make possible the writing and publication of articles (only) that otherwise might not be written or published. They have not been able to recall his first name, so I had not been able to approach him. Nor did I know that the fund was for articles only, for they did not.

For a longer period of time - since early fall or late summer - a vice president of a major publishing house in NYC who saw some of my more recent materials, knowing his house would not touch this, has been casting a round for a means of helping. Monday I got from him, remarkably, a letter written to one of his authors with whom he had discussed my publishing problems from this man, with an explanation of the fund. This man had sent it to him with the suggestion he send it to me. Yesterday I phoned, was welcomed (the director's wife, apparently, was a fan of my early work), spent some time with this man, and by an even more astounding coincidence, had an unscheduled lunch with a man I've known slightly for some time who turns out to be one of the directors. I fully expect this man and his wife (also familiar with WHITEWASH and a doctor) this weekend.

Now, because there apparently is the limitation of an article and because the help can be enormously important to me, in the back of my mind has been this question: what kind of an article can I propose that will not jeopardize future or current research, probing and pushing and still be helpful, not just the boiling of a pot to get a little steam. Two things have occurred to me.

One is largely done, the Agnew part of chapter 18. The other is an article on the status of the Archives as reflected in the Ferrie-documents situation that exists today, after all these years. This came to mind earlier when I drafted the enclosed letter to Woods. If I do the Ferrie article, that is, if I propose and they accept, I'd want to use the summary of CD75, pointing out what it says, whether or not it means it, listing the pages of CD75 with references to him, telling of his what I know (possibly including the 544 stuff), etc. So, I write to get your thoughts and, if you have objections, a statement of them. As you both know, I have felt that this is the time for silence and hard work. But if a major magazine piece can appear, with what is now going on, I think it might help, especially if it deals with the integrity of government and the freedom of information. Here two things would be very helpful: the other Ferrie citations I've asked you to see if Jim can come up with, and a N.O. FBI report on a check on Oswald at the Double-Chek Corp. I had this and do not have it filed under D-C. Finding it would be a large job. I know it is hidden in CE1911 (#3H712) as "Couble - Chek". There is no listing 1967 NOPhone book for this one or Carol Ambern (there is for Duble-Check Systems of the South, inc. different address). If you can retrieve this expeditiously, assuming you also have it, that would help in any event, for I'll have future use. for it.//I'll be considering this, but I'd like your opinions in the event it is feasible, do that if you object, I'll know promptly.

Hastily,